

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 2-4, 6-25 and 34-43 are pending in the instant application. Claims 2, 4, 6, 12-13, and 25 have been amended. Claims 1, 5, and 26-33 are canceled. Claims 34-43 are newly added. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments. Entry and consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

**Response to Objection**

In the Office Action, claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 13 by placing the claims in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, the objection is believed to be overcome and claims 12 and 13 should be allowable.

**Response to Rejections**

Claims 26-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,235 to Shaughnessy. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 25 are rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,185,681, to Zizzi, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,878 to De Armas et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,637,023 to Ginsberg. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,150 to Gebhart et al. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,428 to McDonnal et al. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and in view of McDonnal et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,908 to Cooper et al. Claims 14, 16 and 23 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and in view of McDonnal et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,310 to Arrouy et al. Claims 15, 18, 20 and 24 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and in view of McDonnal et

Serial No. 09/855,425  
Atty. Docket No. 59095.010100  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 30, 2004

Examiner: YIGDALL, Michael J.

al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,246 to Boucher et al. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and in view of McDonnal et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,481 to Walsh et al. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zizzi, in view of De Armas et al. in view of Ginsberg, and in view of McDonnal et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,109 to Koshisaka. Claims 26-33 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shaughnessy in view of Ginsberg. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 6-11, and 14-25, as amended, as well as newly added claims 34-43, depend from allowable claims 12 and 13, and are allowable at least for their dependency from claims 12 and 13.

Claims 1, 5, and 26-33 have herein been canceled, thus rendering the above rejections moot.

Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation directing at canceled claims.

Serial No. 09/855,425  
Atty. Docket No. 59095.010100  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 30, 2004

Examiner: YIGDALL, Michael J.


### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present invention is in condition for allowance, and Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of the application, he is courteously requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

### **AUTHORIZATION**

This paper is timely filed. Thus, no fee is due by this filing. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this paper, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0653.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Goepel (Reg. No. 50,851)  
Agent for Applicant

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1750 Tyson's Boulevard, Suite 1200  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 903-7536  
E-mail: goepelj@gtlaw.com

Date: June 29, 2004